



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,278	11/08/2000	Robert Aigner	GR 98 P 1686	9981

7590 02/20/2002

Lerner and Greenberg P A  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

BUDD, MARK OSBORNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2834	

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 708298	Applicant(s) <i>Aigner</i>
	Examiner <i>M. Budd</i>	Group Art Unit 3-834

*new*  
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address--

**Period for Response**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

**Status**

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-1-01

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claim(s) 1-7

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)**

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
  - received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment(s)**

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5 (10-1-01)  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Office Action Summary**

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Mang, Yamada or Carson.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Mang, Yamada or Carson in view of Arvanitis, Fujita or Von Bach for the specific reasons set forth in paper no. 4 (8-30-01).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Mang, Yamada or Carson in view of Tajima, Ochiai or Kawashima for the reasons noted in paper no. 4 (8-30-01).

Regarding applicants comments the examiner is unable to discern any difference between the frequency adjusting layers of Mang, Yamada or Carson and applicants "layer having a structure setting a prescribed resonant frequency of the piezo electric resonator". Would there be any way to structurally tell one from the other in the final product? The answer is no. Structurally, the finished resonators would be identical.

Optimization of a device e.g. thus routine experimentation has long been held to be within the skill expected of the routineer. It would appear that the spacing of islands and hole diameters are less than the operating wavelength of the references.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2834

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Budd/nt

2-15-02

MARIA U. BUDD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 212